[Second Thousand.]

STATEMENT

IN ANSWER TO

THE REV. DR. CHALMERS' PAMPHLET,

ON

THE SUBJECT OF THE MODERATORSHIP

OF THE

NEXT GENERAL ASSEMBLY:

ON THE PART OF

THE "MINISTERS AND ELDERS"

THEREIN ADDRESSED.

EDINBURGH:
PUBLISHED BY OLIVER AND BOYD;
AND SIMPKIN, MARSHALL, AND CO. LONDON.

MDCCCXXXVII.

EDINBURGH: BALFOUR AND JACK, PRINTERS, NIDDRY STREET.

STATEMENT, &c.

WHEN Dr. Chalmers assailed us with the virulent abuse contained in his letter of the 10th December, we willingly persuaded ourselves to look on it as "something said in choler, ill, and hasty," which, when "he fell to himself again," he would wish unspoken. It grieves us to find that we have been mistaken. He not only perseveres in his accusations against us and Dr. Lee, but maintains them in a spirit and by means which make it more imperative than ever to answer and expose them.* We are deeply sensible of, and from our hearts deplore, the evils of such a warfare among the office-bearers of a Christian church; but the same obligation of duty which rendered it impossible for us by abandonment of Dr. Lee, to lend our sanction to imputations against him which we believed to be unjust, still operates to compel us to adopt measures for destroying their effect, and establishing his defence. Dr. Chalmers had it in his power, by simply placing his recommendation of Dr. Gardiner on the mere nomination of the old Moderators, to have avoided the whole of this unhappy controversy; but *he* having chosen to act otherwise, left *us* no option but that of entering upon the course we have pursued. So far as we have yet proceeded, we feel satisfied that we have used towards Dr. Chalmers the greatest forbearance; and from many considerations, we would willingly have continued to do so, even to the same

* In alluding in his recent pamphlet to this letter, it is melancholy to observe, that Dr. Chalmers never seems for a moment to consider *whether it was right or wrong in itself*, but only how far it was calculated to *further his object;* and accordingly, while stating that he understood it was considered "too strong *for the taste* of the metropolis," he holds it to be an unanswerable justification that it was "*not* too strong" *to arrest the effect* of the resolutions of the 2d December in the provinces.

full extent as hitherto. But we now feel that firmness and plain speaking are essential to the performance of the task to which we are called.

The object of his pamphlet in answer to which this statement is submitted, is to prove that Dr. Lee is unfit to be trusted in the Moderator's chair, because he is "disaffected to the Extension of the Church," and is ready to betray her from subserviency to a hostile government, whose objects are sought to be accomplished by his promotion to the Moderatorship :—the agents being a set of reckless unprincipled men, leagued together with that government, having "no other object than at the expense of her dearest interests to achieve for themselves a party and political triumph," and attempting to practise a gross delusion on the Church, under the screen of the "venerated names" of certain "kind and amiable but withal simple hearted Clergymen," the contemptible dupes of others, who "if not wiser are wilier than themselves."

If this be so, then undoubtedly should Dr. Lee be excluded from the chair, not only for "*this time*" but *for ever*, and he and his supporters should be branded with infamy, and driven not merely from their stations as office-bearers of the Church, but from the society of honest and honourable men.

On these charges we are willing to meet Dr. Chalmers. In one respect, however, in doing so at present, we are necessarily put to great disadvantage. The accusations against Dr. Lee are in a great measure founded on his evidence before the Royal Commission of Enquiry. Dr. Chalmers disclaims having had that evidence before him, but he gives certain statements of its contents, pledging himself for their substantial accuracy. Dr. Chalmers having thus had access to information of some kind at least as to the contents of the evidence, we never doubted, that, such information having been obtained, the Royal Commissioners would not have hesitated to allow Dr. Lee the use of *his own evidence*, in order to expose misrepresentations of it which had been given to the public, and we therefore requested Dr. Lee to favour us with a statement on the subject. Dr. Lee thereupon applied to the Commissioners to be allowed to see his own evidence. This however they refused ; and Mr. Bell, who of course had access to it, felt himself precluded, after this resolution, from using the evidence himself, or allowing us to use it. In these circumstances, confiding in Dr. Chalmers's sense of justice, that he would not use materials as to an individual's evidence, against him, and refuse to that individual access to these, if in his possession, to enable him to meet his charges, we applied to Dr. Chalmers himself for the materials from which he had drawn the information published in his pamphlet. In answer, Dr. Chalmers

stated, "that he did not collect and reserve any more of Dr. Lee's evidence before the Royal Commissioners than what is published in the pamphlet." We made still another attempt in another quarter, but there also we failed; and thus are totally excluded from all reference or access to that evidence.

In these circumstances, it may be thought that we might have postponed our defence till the publication of the evidence, especially as that is expected so shortly to take place. The charges advanced by Dr. Chalmers, however, are so aggravated and injurious, and the pamphlet is so ably and artfully written, and withal so unfettered, as to render it incumbent on us to appeal to the public, calling on them in a way which may be effective, to suspend their judgment on those charges founded upon the alleged statements of Dr. Lee in his evidence before the Royal Commissioners, till that evidence can be adduced; and the grounds on which we call for this suspension of judgment, are such as we know must be attended to. From the materials which we do possess, we shall establish incontrovertible grounds for the distressing but irresistible conviction, that no reliance can be placed on the statements of Dr. Chalmers as to that evidence, without the production of the evidence itself.

This is, we feel, a very grave statement, and very startling as applied to Dr. Chalmers, but if we succeed in establishing it, as we too surely know that we shall, we are fully confident that we shall not ask in vain for a suspension of judgment on those points, in regard to which we are precluded for the present from giving a full explanation.

We proceed accordingly to consider the various statements in the pamphlet, taking them in a great measure in the order in which they there occur.

It will be remembered that the intention to bring forward Dr. Lee for the Moderator's chair of the General Assembly of 1837 was announced in last Assembly by the Rev. Dr. Welsh:—that at the first meeting of the old Moderators, held at the time of the Assembly, he was proposed by Drs. M'Gill and Thomson, the only two present, of the four, who, according to the understanding among the body, had the selection this year of their nominee:—that no objection was stated to him:—that no other person was mentioned, and that the meeting separated, *apparently* at least, acquiescing in Dr. Lee as the individual to be recommended for the chair. These particulars were alluded to by us in our previous publications; but though they enter essentially into the question at issue, Dr. Chalmers has shewn his skill as a controversialist in passing the greater part of them unnoticed. He takes due advantage, however, of the subsequent meeting of old Moderators in August, when it was for-

mally resolved to recommend Dr. Gardiner to the Church, and when, in consequence, circular letters were written to the Presbyteries announcing this resolution.

The particulars connected with the circulars transmitted by Dr. Chalmers to different presbyteries upon this occasion, afford a tolerably fair specimen of the art which has been employed by him in the whole of this unhappy business.

It appears that he wrote to certain presbyteries a letter, in which Dr. Lee, by an implication not to be misunderstood, was represented as a person not to be trusted; and this representation was conveyed as under the authority of the old Moderators.

At the same time, we gather from his own statements, that he wrote to other presbyteries, other letters, in which the more offensive insinuations against Dr. Lee were omitted, and in which there was no attempt to convey the impression that he had the sanction of the old Moderators for more than the mere statement of the fact, that a certain individual was recommended by them.

In our resolutions of the 2d December, having heard of the terms in which letters had been written, we alluded to them as injurious to the character of Dr. Lee.

Upon this, Dr. Chalmers published his abusive letter in the Advertiser, in the course of which he introduced a specimen of the letters written by him,—but which turns out to be such a specimen of the whole as Mr. Hope Johnstone was of the Church Commissioners. Dr. Dickson in his second letter, brought forward the charge of calumny in a somewhat broader form. And then Dr. Chalmers published his pamphlet, in which he endeavours to screen himself from the charge of calumny, by a disavowal of his circular letter having had reference to Dr. Lee, or of its implying any charge against him, stating that the old Moderators, in their recommendations, "never once mentioned the name of Dr. Lee;" "at the most, we only omitted him as we omitted others." In the same pamphlet he again gives a specimen of the style in which, in his circulars, he recommended Dr. Gardiner; "That he was thoroughly to be trusted in those great public questions which are now pending between the Church and the Government." And he prefixes to this extract the following words: "When I gave the recommendation, *I gave my own reason along with it.*" P. 3.

Now, most of these statements by Dr. Chalmers may perhaps be true; and herein lies the art of the individual who sets so much by "the wisdom of the serpent." It is true that he wrote such a recommendation of Dr. Gardiner as he has referred to. It is true that he gave his own reason along with it. And perhaps there were some cases in which he did not mean it to be understood in reference to Dr. Lee. But though these statements are true, do

they contain the whole truth? Let the reader judge after perusing the following specimen:

"BURNTISLAND, *August* 29, 1836.

"MY DEAR SIR,

At a recent meeting of the old Moderators in Edinburgh, it was unanimously resolved that they should recommend to their brethren throughout the Church, as Moderator of the next General Assembly, Dr. Gardiner of Bothwell, a most respectable country minister, of a country presbytery, and selected *on the special ground* that he is thoroughly to be depended upon for the soundness of his views on all those questions which are now pending between the Church and the Government. *There cannot be imagined a greater mischief to befal us at the present juncture, than to have a Moderator not possessed of the right zeal, or the right intelligence on these questions, and more especially if cold or disaffected either to the extension of the Church, or to a right university system for the education of its ministers.*

"I shall be most happy to understand that *these views of the old Moderators* meet with the acquiescence of your co-presbyters," &c. (Signed) "THOMAS CHALMERS."

Now, we ask any one to read this letter, and keeping in view the circumstances in which it was written, and the reasons Dr. Chalmers now gives for excluding Dr. Lee, to say, whether it is possible to entertain a doubt that it *had* personal reference to that individual, and *did* import a charge against him.

If there could be any doubt upon the subject, it would be removed by the statement in the 8th page of Dr. Chalmers's pamphlet,—where he mentions the panic into which he was thrown after the Commission of September 1835, at the idea of Dr. Lee's success,—his call upon Dr. Grant to withdraw his recommendation,—his engaging for the first time in the circulation of the usual notices. It was the dread of Dr. Lee's appointment that awakened this new-born zeal,—and is it to be supposed, in these circumstances, that the praise which he gave of Dr. M'Leod as thoroughly to be trusted in the questions between the Church and government, did not contain an allusion to the circumstance which he believed disqualified Dr. Lee for the office? The argument is stronger in reference to the second canvass. In the notices respecting Dr. MacLeod, Dr. Chalmers we understand did confine himself to a general statement,—or to a reference to the subject of Church Extension. At that period the university question had not arisen, and Dr. Lee had not given his evidence before the Commons' Committee. Here was a new subject of dissatisfaction and alarm,—and, accordingly, in the letter of the following year, we have a clause about "a right University system of Education." After this will Dr. Chal-

mers still deny that this paragraph was penned with reference to Dr. Lee?

We have quoted from the pamphlet the passage in which he says, that in recommending Dr. Gardiner, "he gave *his own reason* along with it:" and for aught we know when he wrote to the friends of Dr. Lee, he might give it as "his own reason." But we have seen that he at least sometimes spoke of the sentiments of the old Moderators. In the letter we have quoted, the resolution of the old Moderators, said to be *unanimous*, is stated to have been rested "*on the special ground*" set forth in the letter, and the views therein specified are mentioned as being the "*views of the old Moderators.*"

This statement is at total variance with the fact. Not one of the old Moderators, with the exception of Dr. Macfarlan, concurs in these views. Dr. M'Gill, who, as the public are already aware, proposed Dr. Lee to the first meeting of old Moderators, and was not summoned to the second, held on the 11th of August, at this moment is firm as a rock in favour of Dr. Lee. Dr. Thomson has declared, within a few weeks, that if he were a member of next Assembly, he would vote for Dr. Lee. And the Moderate Ex-Moderators are equally decided. One of them observes—"They," (the moderate ex-Moderators,) "have nothing to do with Dr. Chalmers' reasons, which came out some time after the matter was agreed upon. They are called upon to vote for Gardiner, solely because he is the individual selected by the party, or a majority of the party, whose turn it was to nominate." *Another*, announcing the resolution of the second meeting, at which he was present—"In this recommendation" (of Dr. Gardiner) "our friends felt themselves bound to acquiesce. I am not acquainted with Dr. Gardiner, but a warm panegyric was pronounced upon him by his nominators." And again, in a different letter—"The resolution to which I assented, was nothing more than the approbation of a particular name to be proposed to the Church in the manner recently acted on, as coming from the party whose turn it was to nominate." *A third*—"That you are in every way eminently qualified and entitled to be called to the chair, is, I am satisfied, the universal sentiment of the Church of Scotland." And also—"But your character as a theologian, as a man of literature, and a churchman, is much too high to be in the slightest degree affected by any insinuations which, in the heat of the moment, have been thrown out." *A fourth*—"I think it due both to you and to myself to state, that in assenting to the resolution that Dr. Gardiner was a fit person to be proposed as a candidate for the chair of the General Assembly, nothing could certainly be farther from my thoughts, than an intention of casting the

slightest reflection on you or any one else. The above was the only resolution passed or proposed; and I would hold it next to impossible, that any resolution *could* have been *proposed*, and more so, that any could have *passed*, which had either in its object or its tendency to affect your character." And *a fifth*—"I had so often witnessed your zeal in that good cause," (of the Church) "that any thing like a charge of inattention or indifference to it on your part astonished me, especially when the charge was made in such a quarter." So much for his statement, that the views expressed in the above letter were the "views of the old Moderators."*

Dr. Chalmers asserts, however, that he has not said any thing as to Dr. Lee's "*moral* disqualifications," and complains of his charges having been described as "*serious and offensive.*" We venture to think, that the simple charge against a minister of a church, that he is "disaffected" to her extension, cannot properly be characterised otherwise than as "serious and offensive." But let us look at the real nature and extent of Dr. Chalmers's accusations, as fully explained by himself in this pamphlet. Independently altogether of the allegations as to the "monstrous exaggerations,"—the "unfriendliness" and "hostility" of Dr. Lee's evidence,—his having given testimony "of a *deadlier* import than that of all the *enemies*" of the church,—the insinuation of his having made his statistical investigations in his parish with a similar "animus" to that of the agents of the Voluntaries, &c.—the real import of the charges in the pamphlet is, that Dr. Lee out of subserviency to a hostile government, would be ready to sacrifice or betray the interests of the church. Dr. Chalmers alludes to "the possibility of *mischief* being *hatched* between a *government* and a *Moderator*:"—he says that if Dr. Lee were to be elected, the government, which he characterises as "*hostile*" *to the church*, would have a "*like-minded* Moderator:"

* Somewhat akin to this, though free from its most distressing feature, is the official character Dr. Chalmers assumes, in his opposition to Dr. Lee, as convener of the Church Extension Committee. He says, "Am *I(!!)* whom the General Assembly has invested with the charge of this department, to sit an unconcerned spectator and make no endeavour to open the eyes of the church to the danger which I conceive hangs over the interest they have committed to my hands?" Does Dr. Chalmers venture to insinuate that he has the approbation of the Church Extension Committee to the opposition he is now making to Dr. Lee, as being a course of conduct for the benefit of the scheme which the Assembly has committed to the charge NOT of HIM but of THEM? Or does he without their sanction avail himself of his status and character as their convener, to enforce his *individual* objects and views? He knows well that he has *not* their approbation. He must feel satisfied that he could not obtain it, and we put it to him whether he can venture to submit to them a resolution approving of his proceedings as calculated to advance the interests committed to their charge? We should have thought that a person so much alive to the impropriety of a *Moderator* giving the weight of his office to his own opinions, in opposition to those of the church, might, as a *convener*, have been more cautious of giving the weight of his station as such to his own views, without the sanction or approval of the committee over which he presides.

—he charges Dr. Lee with communicating to the Royal Commission, differences in opinion with his brethren which he would not communicate to themselves,* and thus infers,—"no bad intimation of the danger that the church would incur by a Moderator, who, having no common understanding with his brethren at large, would pour his unknown and before uncommunicated things into the ears of the government itself,"—thereby implying, that when holding the character of Moderator, and so being merely the organ of the church, he would expose her to danger by prostituting his office in giving its weight and authority to his own views, unsanctioned by the church :—in allusion to his present alarm for the safety of the Church Extension scheme, he talks of the "*danger*" being "*nigh*, that a *hostile government*, in *fellowship* with a *heartless* Moderator, might *destroy* it ;" and he winds up his tirade by an appeal to the church, founded on the recollection, "that the immediate, the executive agents of all our troubles in the seventeenth century, were *hireling courtiers*, in *conjunction* with *renegade* clergymen."

Who can read these charges and insinuations without feeling that they imply the blackest imputations of moral disqualification ? And indeed if Dr. Lee were capable of doing but a tenth part of what Dr. Chalmers holds him ready to perform, he would be a traitor to the church, utterly destitute either of honesty or honour.

Assuredly charges like these against a minister of the gospel would require strong grounds to warrant their being preferred, and we now proceed to consider those on which Dr. Chalmers rests them.

It will be kept in mind, that as stated in his pamphlet, Dr. Chalmers in the summer of 1835 himself proposed Dr. Lee to his brethren of the old Moderators, for the chair of 1836, as being the person best entitled to that honour, thus adding *his* testimony on that point, to the general feeling of the church ; and he expresses his satisfaction, (p. 6,) that he should in his "own mind, and when at liberty to range over the whole church for Moderators, have lighted upon Dr. Lee as one of the fittest persons who occurred to him for occupying the chair of the last General Assembly."

In stating the grounds of his preference, he no doubt qualifies his praise in a manner somewhat strange, but still the statement remains, that "*when at liberty to range over the whole church for Moderators*," he fixed on Dr. Lee.

He informs us, however, that in the November following, he withdrew his recommendation ; and it is to the interval we must

* The accusation here made by Dr. Chalmers is peculiarly unjustifiable, inasmuch as the differences referred to had formed the subject of special correspondence between him and Dr. Lee, and had not been made public at the time, on the special request of Dr. Chalmers himself. See below, p. 30.

look for the occurrence which for the first time convinced Dr. Chalmers that Dr. Lee was not to be trusted.

This event, producing so sudden and so extraordinary a change of sentiment, was the tendering a dissent by Dr. Lee from a particular part of a resolution adopted at a meeting of the Commission of Assembly on the 30th of September 1835, on the subject of the Royal Commission of Enquiry. Dr. Chalmers in his pamphlet conceals the ground of that dissent, observing, "what the particular ground was, it is not *necessary* to mention." Had he said that it was not *convenient* to mention it, he would have been nearer the truth, for assuredly it was *most essentially necessary*, considering that he not only rests upon Dr. Lee's dissent on that occasion, as the ground of his own first conviction that Dr. Lee was not to be trusted, but further states it as the "great service" to "their party," in return for which the alleged political partizans of the government are now giving him their support.

It was thus *very* "necessary" to have stated the ground of that dissent. Dr. Chalmers, however, has studiously withheld it, and he has at the same time mentioned the dissent itself in a way to lead to a false belief of its real nature. He says, (p. 6,) "The first circumstance which opened my eyes to this danger," (the danger of Dr. Lee being Moderator,) "was the singular part Dr. Lee took at the meeting of the Assembly's Commission in September 1835, when it resolved on the *all but unanimous expression of its dissatisfaction with the conduct of government* on this very question. He was the only clergyman who grafted a dissent on that resolution, and the only individual who dissented on a particular ground of his own." And again, (p. 7,) "The truth is, that whether intended by him or not, *he achieved for their party a great service.* He broke the clerical unanimity that would else have stood forth *in one entire and unbroken array against them.* He did as much as one man could do to alleviate the discredit which they had incurred by the resolution of the Commission of the General Assembly. They seem to have felt the value of this service, and it is but natural that they should now labour with all their might in their respective spheres and vocations to work out for him a grateful return."

Looking to this statement, it is impossible to dispute that Dr. Chalmers charges Dr. Lee with having refused to concur in the general expression of dissatisfaction with the conduct of government adopted on that occasion. Now, in reality, the *only* point on which Dr. Lee refused to concur in expressing dissatisfaction with the government, was in regard to condemning the Royal Commission *as being an encroachment on the independence of the church*, as to which DR. CHALMERS HIMSELF declared to *that*

very meeting that he did *not consider that any encroachment was intended*, and consequently must have held that *no dissatisfaction on that point should have been expressed.* Incredible as this may seem, it is truly the case, and a slight explanation will show with what worse than perversity, Dr. Chalmers labours to misrepresent the conduct of the individual he has chosen so recklessly to assail.

It will be remembered that on the names of the Royal Commissioners being announced, the Assembly's Commission (13th August 1835,) adopted a strong resolution expressive of their want of confidence in them, and authorising a remonstrance to government on the subject. *In that resolution Dr. Lee concurred.*

Immediately after the meeting broke up, the terms of the Royal Commission were made public, and a considerable excitement instantly arose throughout the Church, on the subject of the clause authorising inquiry to be made into the "pastoral superintendance" afforded to the people, on the ground of its encroaching on the spiritual independence of the Church. The object of those by whom this view was taken up was to induce the Church to disclaim the Commission altogether, and refuse to answer any inquiries under it. Dr. Lee opposed this view, and before the meeting of Commission in September, expressed his sentiments in the Presbytery of Edinburgh, *who concurred in them.* Dr. Chalmers also was very much alarmed at the opposition made to the Royal Commission on this ground, dreading exceedingly the stopping of the investigation, and he exerted himself to counteract this tendency, and so prevent a repudiation of the Commission. Accordingly, at this meeting of the Assembly's Commission in September, Dr. Chalmers obtained leave to address it as Convener of the Church Extension Committee, and in his speech he strongly deprecated the attempts to resist the Commission, and observed,—"He was the more in earnest on this point, because he perceived from the newspapers, that a certain *ultraism* was abroad respecting the limits of the civil and ecclesiastical authorities *on which he was most anxious that the Church should not commit herself, or give an opinion which she might afterwards have reason to retract.*"* It is true that he did not go so far as Dr. Lee on the *abstract principle* of the *right of inquiry by the civil power*, but in so far as regarded *this particular Commission*, he *concurred* entirely with him, stating, after describing what he considered the import of the Commission, "This was the *legitimate* inquiry which the State was about to enter into, and *he did not think there was any aggression intended to be made on the independence of the Church.*" Dr. Cook, on the other hand, on this

* Report in the Scottish Guardian, Oct. 2, 1835.

point, remarked,—"In this respect *a very different interpretation* had been put upon the Commission by his learned friend (Dr. Chalmers) *than he held.* He had also heard that the metropolitan Presbytery of Scotland had taken it in the same sense with his learned friend, and maintained that it was even in perfect harmony with the principles of the Church, and in proof of this had even referred to the Confession of Faith."—"If they admitted this, they would make the king head of the Church in every sense of the word." Accordingly, in his motion, (which expressed dissatisfaction at the former remonstrance not having been attended to,—protested against a doctrine countenanced by government, that every kind of religious instruction was to be equally taken into account, and with that protest enjoined ministers to answer the inquiries put to them,) he concluded with a sentence intended as a condemnation of the supposed encroachment on the Church's independence, and declaring it to be understood, "that the Commission of Assembly hold that it is not competent to the Commissioners to put to individual members any question relative to the doctrine, worship, discipline, or government of the Church." Now, in the whole of this resolution, so far as regarded the expression of dissatisfaction with the government in not attending to the former remonstrance, and the protest against the principle advanced by them, *Dr. Lee concurred;* and his dissent *was limited to the passage last quoted*, which he held inconsistent with the power allowed in the Confession of Faith to the civil magistrate, and which he also held to be uncalled for here, as the Commission did not, as he conceived, in accordance with the expressed opinion of Dr. Chalmers himself, trench on the independence of the Church.*

It is said, however, that he was the *only* minister who dissented This is a mistake. Dr. Burns of Paisley, whose zeal in the cause of Church Extension, even Dr. Chalmers cannot doubt, likewise

* The following are Dr. Lee's reason of dissent.

"Reasons of dissent *against the insertion of the following words* in the resolution of the Commission of the General Assembly, 30th September 1835.

"'It being clearly understood that the Commission of the Assembly held that it is not competent to the Commissioners to put to individual members any questions relative to the doctrine, worship, government, or discipline of the Church,'

"1st, There is no reason to conclude that it has been in the contemplation of his Majesty's government to put any questions on these matters, which it would be improper for individual ministers to answer, and it does not appear to be very becoming to insinuate that there has been an intention which is not expressed in the Commission or instructions.

"2d, It is possible to conceive that various questions might be put on these subjects, on which misapprehensions may be entertained, which it would be for the credit and interest of the Church to remove.

"3d, It is well known that questions on these subjects have been answered without reserve by individual ministers and elders of the Church of Scotland, when

dissented on the same ground, as appears from the minutes, and he defended his opinions on the point by a speech, in which he stated that he considered Dr. Cook's sentiments as "altogether subversive of the connexion between Church and State;" and as if to prove that dissent on *this* ground was no symptom of friendliness to the government, Dr. Burns objected to the resolutions in regard to the dissatisfaction with government as *not strong enough*, and designated a letter of the Home Secretary's as "an insult to the Church;" and others also entertained the same views, though they did not join in the dissent.

It is perfectly obvious, therefore, that this dissent of Dr. Lee does not afford the slightest pretext for the suspicions and allegations against him; and that the *only* point on which he refused to express dissatisfaction, was one as to which *Dr. Chalmers himself thought that no dissatisfaction ought to have been expressed;* and yet, concealing the nature and grounds of Dr. Lee's dissent, he represents him as refusing to concur in the general expression of dissatisfaction, and brands him as thereby lending himself to the service of government, and as rendering himself unworthy of trust, and all this in spite of his concurrence in the vote of want of confidence at the first meeting of the Commission,—his general concurrence with the vote of dissatisfaction at this meeting, and of his having subsequently at a meeting of the Church Extension Committee concurred in a resolution reprobating the conduct of the Commissioners as to the debts on Dissenting Churches, a proceeding which was resented more keenly by the friends of government than any other measure adopted on the part of the Church.

examined by Committees of the House of Commons, and that the answers have not always been very complimentary to the general character of the Church, and yet it is not known that either the General Assembly or any other Church-court has censured these members for answering such questions.

"4th, It is the duty of every minister of the Church to embrace every favourable opportunity of imparting correct information with regard to the principles and practices of the Church; and it would be difficult to assign any satisfactory reason for withholding from the King, or his Commissioners, what a minister should be willing to communicate to every one whom he can benefit by his instruction.

"These reasons refer entirely to questions of a general nature, and not to such as may have a tendency to implicate other members of the Church; but I cannot perceive any impropriety in an individual minister stating what he conceives to be the *peculiar advantages of the form of worship and government, as well as the excellencies of the system of doctrine and discipline established and ratified by law*, and giving an account of the manner in which his time is occupied—in professional study—in the public offices of religion—in private communications with his people—in attendance on Church Courts—and other essential duties of his vocation,—SO AS TO SHEW HOW GREAT A CALL THERE IS FOR PROVIDING AN ADDITIONAL NUMBER OF LABOURERS FOR THE INSTRUCTION, EDIFICATION, AND COMFORT OF A RAPIDLY INCREASING POPULATION, MANY OF WHOM ARE SUNK IN IGNORANCE, AND ADDICTED TO EVERY FORM OF IMMORALITY."

(Signed) "JOHN LEE."

No one will wonder, after this explanation, that Dr. Chalmers should have deemed it "*not necessary*" to state the grounds of Dr. Lee's dissent.

Before leaving this point, we wish to advert to a circumstance which would have staggered any one who did not first form his opinions, and then bend his facts into conformity with them. It is stated in the pamphlet (page 7.) that the motive of those of Dr. Lee's friends, whom Dr. Chalmers calls "a few political lawyers of the Parliament House," in supporting him, is to reward him for the dissent above referred to, as a "great service" to "their party." Now, the fact is, that *not one of* the lawyers referred to concurred in Dr. Lee's dissent, and that *all of them* (with the exception of the Procurator, who as a Commissioner, staid away from the meeting,) actually voted *simpliciter* in favour of that resolution, for his dissenting from which they are now represented as so anxiously "labouring with all their might to work out for Dr. Lee a grateful return."

On the whole, in regard to this branch of the charge, while most people will doubtless agree, that there has been exhibited "*a most particular and unlooked for evolution*," they will be equally satisfied that *Dr. Lee* is not the party by whom it has been performed.

Dr. Chalmers having arrived at his original conviction of Dr. Lee's untrustworthiness through such a strange "perversity of judgment," it was only to be expected that he would endeavour to confirm it by an equally perverse twisting of other circumstances.

The instances of this to which we shall first advert are exhibited in the observations in his pamphlet regarding ourselves. He observes, "And it serves only to *confirm* our apprehension the more, when we look to the *supporters* of Dr. Lee, and take a special account of *who they are*;" and this he accordingly proceeds to do in his own strange way.

He first of all singles out Mr. Bell* as the principal person to be dealt with in the matter; thus holding him forth as the main originator of the proposal of bringing forward Dr. Lee. By this means he seeks to give to the proposing of Dr. Lee, the character on the one hand, of a measure mainly originating with a layman, and so opposed to the natural feeling among ministers, against laymen exercising an initiative in this matter; and on the other, of a party and political scheme. In this, he may well claim credit for the "policy and address" he ascribes to us; and a statement of the real facts will still farther shew, that if the compliment, such as it is, paid by him to

* We do not advert to the personal attacks on Mr. Bell, as he is to reply to them himself.

" the three ecclesiastics" is not altogether applicable to himself as it stands, he is fully entitled to the *converse* of it, having well learnt *his* " lesson from the serpent."

No one knows better than Dr. Chalmers the circumstances regarding the nomination of Dr. Lee, having been himself cognizant of them all along. Prior to the Assembly 1835, of course before any of those circumstances occurred which could by possibility be supposed to give a political colour to the matter, Dr. Welsh communicated with Dr. Chalmers as to the propriety of having Dr. Lee suggested for the chair of the Assembly 1836. Dr. Chalmers expressed his concurrence, and *with his approbation and at his request* Dr. Welsh *intimated to Dr. Lee* the sentiments of Dr. Chalmers who wrote to Dr. Grant recommending Dr. Lee, as mentioned in his pamphlet. In November Dr. Chalmers told Dr. Welsh that he had changed his opinion as to the propriety of bringing forward Dr. Lee, in consequence of what had passed in the Commission. Dr. Welsh considered the grounds of that opinion erroneous, and felt bound in honour not to desert Dr. Lee ; but with a view not to disturb the peace of the Church, he proposed to his friends not on that occasion to oppose Dr. M'Leod, the individual nominated by the old Moderators, reserving to them to make a statement in the Assembly then ensuing. This statement was accordingly made, and Dr. Gordon and Dr. Welsh agreed, that if the old Moderators did not bring forward Dr. Lee, it would be absolutely necessary, after what had passed, that they and their friends should do so. It being however understood at the time that the old Moderators had agreed on Dr. Lee, no steps were taken till after the result of the second meeting had become known, and then, in accordance with the sentiments of Dr. Gordon and many others,* the steps were taken which have given rise to this discussion.

These circumstances are stated on the authority of Dr. Gordon and Dr. Welsh. None of them are however brought forward by Dr. Chalmers ; for though the incidental observation—" even though it is possible that they," viz. Drs. Gordon and Dickson, and Mr. Candlish,—" may have originated the movement,"—may afford a sort of loop-hole to himself, it conveys no information of the truth to others. But this is not all. He has used expressions in his account of his having suggested Dr. Lee to Dr. Grant, which would exclude the idea of any of the parties now in question having at that time been in any way committed to Dr. Lee, or having proposed him. He talks of having " *in his own mind*, and when at liberty to range over the whole Church for Moderators," "*lighted* up-

* Among these were Dr. M'Gill, Principal Dewar, Dr. Cormack of Stow, Dr. Brown of Langton, Dr. Stewart of Erskine, and Dr. Burns of Paisley.

on Dr. Lee as one of the fittest persons *who occurred to him* for occupying the chair of the last General Assembly," holding out this step of his as a private proposition of his own, not suggested by others,—in which no others participated, and which necessarily fell to the ground by his abandonment of it,—altogether contrary to the real state of the facts. Now, why is it that he practises all this deceptive concealment? It may be no doubt in part to take to himself the grace and favourable position in this discussion, of having of his own motion proposed Dr. Lee for the chair; but who can doubt that the main reason of concealment must have been, that the truth would have been destructive of the assertion to which he mainly trusts for excluding Dr. Lee, viz. that the whole affair is political, *originating* with political partizans to reward Dr. Lee for subserviency to the government, instead of being, as it really was, the result of an arrangement made before any political matter arose, *with Dr. Chalmers's concurrence, communicated at his request to Dr. Lee*, and from which honourable men could not withdraw, even if they had desired,—which Dr. Gordon and Dr. Welsh certainly did not? For such a purpose does Dr. Chalmers conceal facts, of which he was perfectly cognizant, and having thereby drawn a conclusion which is false, he uses that conclusion to accuse Dr. Welsh, towards whom, he all the time professes the warmest regard, of tampering with "public weal and private friendship," for the sake of a heartless political partizanship!

Dr. Chalmers next endeavours to get rid altogether of Dr. Gordon, Dr. Dickson, and Mr. Candlish. This he does with the most easy coolness, telling them with an air of condescending and contemptuous kindness, that they are "kind and amiable, but withal simple-hearted clergymen," who, in total ignorance of Dr. Lee's opinions, and of the whole matter, have stept into a trap too apparent to have caught any beyond the capacity of simpletons. Without pretending to the overstrained jealousy and suspicion of Dr. Chalmers, who seems to see an enemy of the Church in every man that differs from himself on any point regarding it, they must decline the defence so obligingly invented for them. They were perfectly aware of the "nature and tendency" of Dr. Lee's evidence, which was publicly given. They conceive that Dr. Chalmers has put a most unjustifiable gloss on it, and that the conclusions he has drawn from it are altogether unwarranted; they have deliberately, and from firm conviction, entered on the course they are now pursuing, and equally attached to the Church and the cause of her extension with Dr. Chalmers himself, as they have proved by their conduct, they deprecate his present proceedings as in the highest degree injurious to that cause. They cannot expect, and they do not ask, to escape the discourteous and offensive treatment which

has been so liberally bestowed on all the supporters of Dr. Lee, but they think that they *have* a title to demand that it shall not in *their* case be accompanied with expressions of respect, with which it is so totally at variance.

Having thus, as he fancies, "removed the three ecclesiastics," reserving the Rev. Dr. Welsh for separate consideration, he represents as the real and only participators with the Procurator in the measure, the remaining parties mentioned in Dr. Dickson's letter, viz. Mr. More, Mr. Monteith, Mr. Dunlop, and Mr. Cowan. Now, in regard to these individuals, it is truly ludicrous to witness the absurd pertinacity with which he clings to his own preconceived notions on the subject. He had determined that the proposing of Dr. Lee *must* be a step purely political, to subserve the ends of the present government, and according to custom he must make the *facts* bend to that opinion. Seeing well, however, that an individual consideration of these parties would compel him to admit how flagrantly he was in the wrong as to this point, he slumps them all together as "a few political lawyers of the Parliament House," "the declared and eager partizans of a government that have been sorely embarrassed by this very question,"—who are labouring "with all their might in their respective spheres and vocations to work out for Dr. Lee a grateful return" for the service done "their party" by the dissent already adverted to, and whom he elsewhere describes as "having no other object than through the medium of the Church, and at the expense of her dearest interests, to achieve for themselves a party and political triumph."

Now mark how plain a tale will put him down.

Of these FIVE persons, (including the Procurator,) *only* TWO, as Dr. Chalmers well knows, are *adherents of the present government*, for whose behoof they are all represented as so zealously co-operating.

Then, even of those two, Dr. Chalmers himself must admit that one of them, Mr. Monteith, never hesitated between his political attachments and the interests of the Church. He it was who framed the celebrated original resolution of want of confidence in the Royal Commission adopted by the Assembly's Commission:—he concurred in the second resolution of dissatisfaction, and took part in the arrangements for carrying it through, and it was he who *moved* the resolutions in the Church Extension Committee, condemnatory of the conduct of the Commissioners as to the debts of dissenting churches, which are said to have been so bitterly offensive to his political friends. There is no pretext, therefore, even if his character alone should not have prevented such a charge, for entertaining the base suspicion that he would sacrifice the interests of the Church to his political partialities.

Having thus exposed Dr. Chalmers' wretched attempt to get rid of the clerical portion of our number, as not of their own will and judgment supporting Dr. Lee, and of the rest as subservient political partizans, let us see how far the real character and sentiments of these parties warrant his statement that *their* support confirms his apprehensions of danger to the interests of the Church, and especially to the cause of her extension, from the appointment of Dr. Lee to the Moderator's chair.

Reading Dr. Chalmers' presumptuous assumption to himself, of the whole charge of the Church Extension Scheme, and of the character, in the present matter, of champion of the interests entrusted to the Committee of which he is Convener, against the assaults of the enemies of extension, no one would consider it credible that the individuals accused by him of being engaged in this attack, are the *very* persons who have been throughout *among the most active, steady and zealous members of that same Committee.* YET SO IT IS. One and all of them are members of that Committee, and among them are the individuals who mainly effected the arrangement by which Dr. Chalmers was appointed Convener in room of the gentleman who, previously to 1834, held that situation, after it had been proposed to another individual and declined. Almost all of them are members of the acting Sub-Committee *selected by Dr Chalmers himself,* and have throughout been his active, steady, unflinching coadjutors in the whole proceedings and struggles in which they have been engaged. One of their number, (Mr. Monteith) as stated by Dr. Chalmers, was strongly urged by him and the deputation to London, as a person whom, possessing their peculiar confidence, they anxiously desired to have named as one of the Royal Commissioners of Enquiry, but was rejected by his own political friends, as *too* partially and zealously embarked in the cause of Church Extension. Another (Mr. Dunlop) was selected by Dr. Chalmers, to occupy the important station of Convener of the Statistical Sub-Committee, was chairman of the Committee which prepared the resolutions condemnatory of the conduct of the Royal Commissioners, touching the debts on dissenting churches, and has taken a very active part in the business of the committee. A third, (Mr. Cowan) at the commencement acted as Secretary to the Committee, and has taken a most active and laborious part in all its proceedings; and these two individuals last named, have also shewn their zeal for Church Extension by having been among the chief promoters of the additional City Church at Greenside. A fourth, (Mr. Candlish) a constant attendant at the Committee board, has mainly accomplished the erection of the Young Street Church, the first new Church built by voluntary contribution within the city; and a fifth, (Dr. Dickson) has for years successfully exerted himself in increasing the number of Churches in the

parish of St. Cuthberts. The four first named individuals, with the Rev. Dr. Welsh, have throughout co-operated with Dr. Chalmers, steadily and zealously, forming nearly a majority of the regularly attending members of the acting sub-Committee, approved of, applauded, confided in, by Dr. Chalmers, *down to the very moment* when they refused to chime in with his sovereign will and pleasure in excluding Dr. Lee from the Moderator's chair; and *from that instant* they became in his eyes, either a parcel of silly dupes, or a set of reckless enemies of the cause they had so long and so ardently supported, ready to sacrifice the best interests of the Church, and all massed together—whigs—tories and non-partizans, engaged in one foul conspiracy to achieve a *common* political triumph to a hostile government, and to reward Dr. Lee for an act in which they were themselves ranged against him.

Can prejudice be imagined more perverse and inveterate than this? And what weight, by any reflecting mind, ought to be given to the opinion, on the true character and sentiments of Dr. Lee, of a man who can in an instant, and without the shadow of a real cause, so totally alter his sentiments of his long known, thoroughly proved friends and co-adjutors, and form a judgment of them, so utterly false?

In regard to the true character and sentiments of Dr. Lee, until the charges made against him by Dr. Chalmers, these were never questioned, and we challenge his opponents to point out in his previous life the slightest trace of subserviency to men in power, or of indifference, far less of hostility to the extension of the Church.

Under a former government, with whose sentiments he is understood to have concurred much more nearly than with those of the present, he stood forth boldly to oppose a great government measure which he believed (whether rightly or wrongly we need not say) to be fraught with evil—the Roman Catholic emancipation act, which Dr. Chalmers so zealously and effectively supported. Under the same government he unhesitatingly gave offence to many influential persons connected with it, by his strenuous exertions, (carried on with great personal labour, and by considerable expenditure of his own private funds,) to procure the blessing of cheap Bibles to the poor, by contesting the prerogative of the king to make the printing of it a monopoly. Under the present administration he came forward prominently in resistance to a measure with which their policy is peculiarly identified—the Irish National Education scheme; and throughout his whole life, we venture with confidence to say, that there is not a trace of that subserviency with which he is now so recklessly charged, in a form which imputes to him the basest motives, and the most unprincipled designs.

Then as to his supposed indifference to the cause of Church

extension, he has, on the contrary, shewn that he was peculiarly alive to it when the great mass of his brethren were altogether insensible to its importance.

He strove, though in vain, to have the Cowgate Chapel received as a Chapel of Ease in connexion with the Establishment, when that measure was opposed by the leaders on both sides of the Church.

He resisted the attempt in 1827 to reduce the number of parishes in the Old Town, and contended for the necessity of increasing them. The scheme of the Bill then proposed, provided for the positive suppression of two parishes in the Old Town; and it will be observed, the proposition was not to uncollegiate double charges and transfer the ministers to the New Town, but to suppress two of the existing Churches and Parishes in the Old Town altogether. Having been brought under consideration of the Presbytery, it was remitted to a Committee, who, after some meetings with the Town Council, reported their opinion, that *only* one of the parishes in the Ancient Royalty should be suppressed, but that so modified, *the proposal should be approved of.* When this report came before the Presbytery, a motion was made to approve of it, and assent to the measure so modified. On the other hand, Dr. Lee moved as follows:—"That the Presbytery *withhold* their concurrence from the proposition of the Town-Council, on the ground, that as the population of the Old Town is rapidly increasing, and the inhabitants cannot be expected to be accommodated in the Churches of the New Town, *it appears to be necessary rather to provide additional Churches in the Old Town, and add to the number of ministers, than to diminish the number of ministers and parishes in the Old Town.*" This motion, however, was lost, the only clergymen who supported Dr. Lee, being the two ministers of the Tolbooth parish, the late Drs. Davidson and Campbell.

On that occasion, (Feb. 14, 1827), in supporting his motion, after adverting to the increase of population between 1811 and 1821,* Dr. Lee proceeded, (we quote from the newspapers of the day):—"This he presumed ought to be a sufficient reason to ADD ONE OR TWO CHURCHES TO THE NUMBER NOW EXISTING, rather than lessen them. He had no objection *that some of the churches should be uncollegiated;* yet he conceived the Presbytery would not discharge its duty did they not take care that the people should be *amply* furnished with religious instruction, and he submitted that *such could not be done were the plans proposed to be agreed to.*"

* By the census of 1831, it appears that subsequently to 1821 there has been a great *decrease* in the population of the old town; and lately, in determining as to a new division of the city into parishes, the Presbytery resolved that there should be eight in the new, and ten in the old town, being still two more than would have subsisted under this provision of the statute if acted upon.

Such sentiments he has continued to express and act on down to the present hour. In the very dissent on which Dr. Chalmers rests so much, but at the same time withholds, there is a most express declaration of his sense of the propriety of the clergy giving fully the information there referred to, "*so as to shew how* GREAT A CALL *there is for providing an* ADDITIONAL NUMBER *of labourers for the instruction, edification, and comfort of a rapidly increasing population, many of whom are sunk in ignorance, and addicted to every form of immorality.*" In like manner, in the pastoral addresses framed by him, and particularly that on the General Fast in 1835, the guilt of the nation and Church in not sufficiently extending the means of religious instruction to meet the wants of an increasing population, is specially and strongly dwelt on; and it is curious to observe that while Dr. Chalmers is so violently accusing Dr. Lee of hostility to Church Extension, other parties, staunch friends to the Church, though not of it, make it a serious ground of objection to the address on the Fast prepared by Dr. Lee, that it gives an *undue prominence and importance* to the shortcoming of the Church in regard *to that particular* matter—this being the *only* offence, substantively and positively confessed, instead of being put hypothetically, like her other sins.* There are not many ministers of the Church, who, if charged with disaffection to her extension, could adduce so many *positive* proofs of attachment to it, as we have thus done in regard to Dr. Lee. We feel fully convinced, that when his evidence is published, it will only prove how steadily he adheres to the principles he has so long maintained;† and we hesitate not again to repeat, with augmented confidence, that "we know Dr. Lee to be most cordially interested in the welfare of the church, and in the great schemes of *extension*, education, and missionary enterprize, in which she is at present engaged."

In regard, to the inferences drawn by Dr. Chalmers from that evidence, as we are at present precluded from disproving them by

* Presbyterian Magazine for December 1836. This journal is the organ of the body to which the late Dr. M'Crie belonged. Their remark is, "It is to be regretted that the necessity of reformation to bring down the blessing of God on the Established Church appears to be too much forgotten by her friends. Their *attention is almost wholly occupied by her extension; so much so*, that in the late act of the General Assembly for fasting, although many other sins are *supposed* to exist, *yet* NO SIN IS DIRECTLY ACKNOWLEDGED BUT THE SIN OF THE CHURCH IN NEGLECTING HER EXTENSION." P. 313.

† A circumstance trifling in itself, but indicative of Dr. Lee's personal feelings on the subject, may perhaps not be unworthy of notice. When Dr. Lee left Lady Yester's, some members of his congregation subscribed for the purpose of presenting him with a token of their respect and regard, and waiting on him to communicate their wishes, he stated that the manner of disposing of their contributions which would afford most gratification to him, would be, instead of a present of plate or the like, to devote it to the *Church Extension fund.*

quoting the evidence, we must commence by requesting our readers to keep in view the proof we have already laid before them, that in his account, either of facts or of documents referred to by him, Dr. Chalmers "is not thoroughly to be depended upon," and we regret to say that we shall still have more proof to bring to the same effect.

It is obvious, even on looking to his statements regarding Dr. Lee's evidence, that these are grossly partial, and so far as they are extracts, entirely garbled, Dr. Chalmers avowedly withholding all modifying and explanatory statements. This is not the course which *could* have been adopted by a person conscious that he was right in the conclusions he professes to draw. Had Dr. Chalmers been so, he would have given the whole answers, or the modifying and explanatory passages, which, from his reference to them, he undoubtedly must have had before him, and then have shewn, that notwithstanding, his conclusion was just. He would have *trusted* his readers with the context. This he has not done, and there could not therefore but arise a suspicion, that a fair representation of the import of the evidence is not given—a suspicion confirmed, not merely by the exhibition of similar conduct as to other parts of the discussion, but also by the statements as to this branch which we have now to submit.

The first point in regard to Dr. Lee's evidence before the Royal Commissioners to which Dr. Chalmers adverts, is that respecting the extent of yearly change in the inhabitants of the poorer districts of the Old Town parishes.

He represents this as got up by Dr. Lee, solely for the purpose of contradicting the testimony given by himself *on the 20th February* 1836, as to the Water of Leith. Now, the fact is, that Dr. Lee's attention had been previously drawn to this circumstance some time before. It had also been called to it in the previous part of the winter 1835-6, in the course of certain proceedings in a Committee of the Presbytery of Edinburgh, revived in November 1835, regarding the division of the town into parishes. In order to expose the unsound basis on which a scheme of division, prepared by a Committee of the Town-Council, had been framed, whereby the total number of parishes was proposed to be only thirteen, of which nine were to be in the Old Town, he had obtained access to the survey books of the Improvement Commissioners. In the inspection of these books, he was struck with the proofs of a frequency of migration much beyond what he had previously supposed. He followed this up by personal investigation, and he stated the result in his examination as to his own parish on the *18th February*, *before* Dr. Chalmers had given evidence on that point at all.

Dr. Chalmers, on his examination on the 20th, made statements tending apparently to throw doubt on those of Dr. Lee as to this

point. In consequence Dr. Lee took steps for more fully verifying the results of his previous investigations. He was not contented with trusting to the statements of parties themselves on a point on which they are apt to mislead, but having also recourse to the survey-books already mentioned, the information of persons employed to take up the population, and particularly of proprietors and the factors of proprietors of tenements of houses in his parish, there can be little doubt of the superior accuracy of his investigations to those of the individuals employed by Dr. Chalmers, who, however intelligent, could not have the same advantages as the minister of the parish, assisted by the other checks to which he had recourse. Indeed, Dr. Lee's investigations have all the advantage over those of Dr. Chalmers' "statists," that Dr. Chalmers claims for the investigations of the latter over those of the Voluntaries, and their accuracy will be fully maintained, tried by any test whatever.

It may be perfectly true that the state of matters is very different at the Water of Leith. The character of the two places is altogether different. At the Water of Leith there are large mills giving stated employment to a considerable number of persons who are necessarily to a great degree stationary, and the locality also affords facilities for peculiar classes of employments *carried on in that locality*, which circumstance has a great tendency to promote permanency of residence among the inhabitants. In the Old Church Parish, on the contrary, there is no tie of any kind to attach the inhabitants to the particular locality, and from the general poverty, nay, wretchedness of the dwellings, they are occupied by a class living more by precarious than stated employments, and consequently of peculiarly migratory habits. Indeed, a very large proportion have their rooms, or shares of a room, only taken from week to week, and the migration of this class is even greater than has been represented.

But, after all, Dr. Chalmers himself admits, that the true tendency of this fact is to *strengthen* the claim for additional pastoral superintendence. Then supposing it to be as Dr. Lee states, or even giving him the mere credit, if Dr. Chalmers can be so unusually liberal, of not being *wilfully* wrong, but himself believing its truth, was he to conceal this fact because ignorant persons might misapply it? No one will be so absurd as to say so. Dr. Chalmers, however, more than insinuates that Dr. Lee brought forward the fact under the improper motive of diminishing the effect of *his* evidence, and discrediting the advantages to be derived from an increase of pastoral superintendence.

This insinuation is utterly unwarranted.

So far from investigating and bringing forward these facts with reference to Dr. Chalmers's evidence, Dr. Lee had commenced the inquiry with a totally different view, and when he stated them on

his first examination, Dr. Chalmers had not made any statement on the subject; and his subsequent inquiries were necessary to verify what Dr. Chalmers appeared afterwards to have called in question.

Then, so far from having adduced them with a view to discredit the necessity of increased pastoral superintendence, the jet of Dr. Lee's evidence on that point, was to show how much greater amount of pastoral superintendence was requisite for a population of the kind he was describing, and the proportionably heavier burden which lay on the ministers of parishes in the poor districts of towns. Nor was this a new view on the part of Dr. Lee. He had always evinced a great anxiety for maintaining and increasing the efficiency of the Establishment in the Old Town.

When the opportunity occurred for acquiring the Cowgate Chapel, and establishing it as a Chapel of Ease, he was, as we have seen, one of the few ministers who advocated that measure, the rejection of which has been the occasion of so much reproach and regret ever since.

On another occasion in 1827, as also already mentioned, he took the lead in opposing, unsuccessfully however, the resolution of the Presbytery of Edinburgh, in regard to a clause in the Improvements Act, approving of the suppression of one of the Old Town Churches and parishes.

Thus did Dr. Lee evince his anxiety for maintaining, nay, increasing, the number both of ministers and parishes in the Old Town, when similar views were not quite so popular as they are now; and yet in setting forth a peculiar and prominent cause of the difficulties and labours of the ministers of the Old Town, he is to be subjected to having his motives misconstrued, and his objects misrepresented, as if he wished to throw discredit on any scheme for increasing the amount of pastoral superintendence, or the number of parochial divisions in large towns!

Finally, the very investigations founded upon to support this groundless charge, originated in the attempt, on the part of Dr. Lee, to expose the fallacy of a proposed division of the city into parishes, as not providing a sufficient number in the Old Town, for the purpose of maintaining the requisite extent of pastoral superintendence.

So much for the charge founded on Dr. Lee's statements as to the change of residence among the inhabitants of the poorer districts of the Old Town. We now proceed to the next of the charges rested on his evidence before the Royal Commissioners.

This regards his views on the parochial system, which constitute the main ground for accusing him of hostility to the cause of Church Extension.

Dr. Chalmers states his evidence on this point in substance to

be, (p. 13,) " that the idea of making congregations wholly parochial, in a parish like Edinburgh, was chimerical, and in some respects not desirable;" and connected with this is a corresponding statement, (p. 15,) as to the superior efficiency of a minister's ministrations, if relieved of all extra-parochial duty.

On these statements, so isolated from the context, does Dr. Chalmers draw the inevitable conclusion that Dr. Lee is hostile to the Extension of the Church. Now on this we observe,

1. Dr. Chalmers, although he enounces Dr. Lee's opinion to the effect that the idea of making congregations " *wholly*," or " *strictly*" parochial " in *large towns*," is chimerical, throughout his whole argument on it, *assumes* that Dr. Lee objected *to the parochial system generally*, and not to its *strict application*, and that he objected to it equally *in all situations*, as in large towns; and in one place, (p. 17, note,) he actually talks of Dr. Lee having " *denounced as chimerical*," " THE THEORY OF THE PAROCHIAL SYSTEM." This assumption, which is the sole basis of his subsequent conclusions, is on his own showing of the evidence altogether false.

2. Dr. Chalmers was perfectly aware, in summer 1835, when he proposed Dr. Lee for the Moderatorship, of the opinions of the latter as to the parochial system in large towns, having recently had a correspondence with him regarding it, but he did not *then* consider it any objection, although the questions at issue with the Government had at that time been pending for a year.

3. Dr Chalmers studiously withholds every thing in Dr. Lee's answer which might explain his real views on the subject. He seizes this single remark, disconnected from the context,—forces his own meaning on it, contrary even to what he does quote, and then draws his unwarranted conclusions. Now, it must be remembered by those who were present at the examination, that Dr. Lee explained his views to be, that some relaxation of the strictly parochial system was desirable, in order that in parishes like his own, composed *exclusively* of the very poorest classes of the community, there might be in the congregation some admixture of the rich with the poor—an admixture which is certainly advantageous, not only for its moral effect, but for affording facilities in the way both of providing elders, and obtaining from the richer members of the congregation, that pecuniary assistance for carrying into effect benevolent schemes for the advantage of the destitute population of the parish, which it would be absolutely impossible to look for within its bounds.*

* Dr. Chalmers presents in his own person as good an instance as could be desired of the beneficial effects that may arise from a certain relaxation of the strictness of the parochial system. Dr. Chalmers lives in the parish of *St. Stephen's*, but sits in the new church of *Dean*. Now, can any one doubt that his constant presence

Individuals may differ as to whether this advantage is not more than counterbalanced by opposing disadvantages, but to consider it a proof of general hostility to the parochial system, and by necessary inference to church extension, that a person approves of a relaxation to admit of these advantages, seems equally ludicrous and wild. Such a relaxation has practically been introduced into every large town. It may be altogether wrong, or it may be carried too far, but still the opinion, that to a certain extent, it is admissible, nay beneficial, can never, by any man not entirely blinded by prejudice, be deemed a proof of disaffection to the parochial system generally throughout the country, and so far as practicable, in towns also.

Accordingly, the Church Extension Committee have never attempted to stipulate for an *exclusively* parochial system. They only stipulate for a *preference* to parishioners. They do not go even so far as has been secured for the new parish of Greenside, (mainly by the efforts of individuals, now assailed as enemies to the cause,) by an arrangement, according to which two-thirds of the Church is not to be let at all to non-parishioners but *exclusively* to parishioners, with a *preference* to them in regard to the remaining third. This is the utmost extent to which the strictness of the parochial system has been attempted to be pushed, and it is greatly beyond what the Extension Committee deem it necessary, or at least advisable to prescribe; but still there is even here a considerable relaxation from the strictness at which Dr. Chalmers seems to point, though most people will admit, that the idea of, in practice, making it more strict, would be "chimerical," and in the poorest parts of the town, "in some respects, not desirable;" and assuredly Dr. Lee, by his anxiety to effect a division of the city into a greater number of parishes, has shown no insensibility to the advantages of the parochial system in large towns, though he does deem its "strict" application impracticable, and "in some respects not desirable."

Assuming, however, that he is totally wrong on this particular point, what possible warrant can that give for holding him hostile to the cause of Church Extension? Because an individual does not concur with us in every particular in regard to the mode of carrying a scheme into execution, is he to be denounced as an enemy to it? All the most zealous friends of the Church Extension cause,

in the comparatively humbler congregation which he himself has done so much to create and to provide with a place of worship, is of infinitely greater service than if he adhered strictly to the parochial rule, by herding with the rich crowd who throng St. Stephen's? Even, however, before the Dean Church was built, he sat *not in St. Stephen's*, but in *St. George's*; and we have heard it doubted whether at any time since he came to Edinburgh he has sat in his own parish church.

attached as much importance to admitting Chapels of Ease to the condition of parochial churches as Dr. Chalmers can possibly do to a strict adherence to the parochial system. They are perfectly satisfied that if that object had not been effected, the Church Extension scheme would have been strangled in its birth, and that its subsequent success is mainly attributable to that great and most admirable measure. Dr. Chalmers, however, and his more immediate adherents in this matter of the Moderatorship, entertained different views, and exerted themselves to defeat it. Dr. Chalmers caused a pamphlet, written by himself, against the admission of chapels without some endowment, to be distributed at the doors of the Assembly.* Dr. Macfarlan denounced it from the chair, and Dr. Gardiner, though in the Assembly that year, did not support it. But what would have been said if all these parties had at once been branded with hostility to the scheme itself, and Dr. Chalmers' appointment resisted, as Convener of the Extension Committee, to whose objects his views, in the opinion of many, on this particular point, would have been so strongly opposed? Yet this would have been far more excusable than the conduct of Dr. Chalmers towards Dr. Lee, which can only be accounted for by the apparent *accumulation* of prejudices in which he seems to have entrenched himself on this subject, and which make him misconstrue with the most unhappy suspicion, every circumstance connected with it.

Having thus explained so far as our present materials admit, the main charge founded on Dr. Lee's evidence, we shall, as to the minor points, delay altogether till by the quotation of the words of the evidence itself, we can more authoritatively expose the glosses

* In this pamphlet Dr. Chalmers described the arrangement proposed by the Chapel Act, as one which would leave the Church "in the same state of shortness and deficiency as before, without making *one footstep* in advance for the overtaking of our unprovided commonalty, and under which the same number of families will remain as destitute of the word and ordinances as they are at this moment," (*Churches and Chapels*, p. 1.) He also observed—"Adopt the measure simpliciter as it had been brought forward, *and we should not expect one Chapel more in consequence. There might be many attempts at more, many* ABORTIONS *all over the land, from the imagined virtue which lay in the mere admission of Chapel Ministers into Presbyteries. But the truth is, that like all other voluntary churches, these chapels too are now pressing hard on a limit which they cannot overpass. The competition has carried the matter as far as the wealth and will of their customers will allow; and they already feel the pressure and the difficulties of an overstocked market.*"—(*Ib.* p. 16.) The measure *was* adopted simpliciter as brought forward, and the result was, that by the very next Assembly there had been erected, or were in progress, 63 new Churches, exactly the number that had been built in the course of the whole previous *century*. Yet after himself exhibiting such total practical ignorance, and such grossly erroneous views on this subject, he, as if he had never committed a mistake regarding it, talks, referring to Dr. Lee, of casting "rebuke on the head of that precipitate adventurer who has rushed unbidden into a field on which, to him a *terra incognita*, a land of bewilderment and darkness, he ought never to have entered."

and unwarranted inferences contained in the pamphlet. We feel we can do this with perfect safety. As to one of the points touched upon however we desire to remark, that we trust the day will never come when the suggestion of additional schools in *connection with the Church* for *Scriptural* education, will be deemed a proper subject for a sneer. If Dr. Lee had shewn any approbation of a system of education *without* religious instruction, there might have been some room for the insinuation implied in pointing out "the precise *coincidence* between this declaration and *the reigning policy of the times.*" Knowing however, as Dr. Chalmers does, that in 1833 it was *Dr. Lee* who brought the subject of the Irish National Education system before the Presbytery of Edinburgh, for the purpose of moving a petition to Parliament *against* it, we can only look on this remark, as one of those instances—far too numerous in this pamphlet—by which, to aid his purpose, Dr. Chalmers seeks to turn some strong feeling against the cause which he opposes, in total disregard either of truth, or of the injury to be inflicted on the character of the party he assails.

While, however, we thus pass over those minor charges which the publication of the evidence is necessary fully to expose, there is one point on which it so happens that we have the means of contrasting Dr. Chalmers' account of the evidence with the evidence itself.

Although Dr. Chalmers alleges that Dr. Lee's evidence was got up in answer to his, delivered on the 20th of February, it is curious enough that *all* the references made by him, are to Dr. Lee's evidence *on the* 18*th*, *two days before*—with *one* single exception, that under article 9. (p. 17.) Here there is a reference to the final statement given in by Dr. Lee, of the greater part of which we have in our possession very full notes.

Dr. Chalmers' account of it is as follows—"I shall conclude these instances taken from the evidence of Dr. Lee, with one observation more of his, and I leave it with my brethren in the Church to determine the character which it stamps on this whole enterprise. He told you, Sir, after he had made his statements—That he had no favourite theory to support,* that he did not agree with his brethren; but that he did not like to come into collision with them although their views were different from his own.—These may not be the words, but they contain *the very substance of his declaration*, and the effect of which is not to be impaired, Sir, by all the expletives and the qualifying clauses wherewith it is accompanied."

The passage in Dr. Lee's evidence to which this allusion is

* "Meaning, I believe, the theory of the PAROCHIAL SYSTEM, WHICH HE HAD BEFORE DENOUNCED AS CHIMERICAL (!!)—AND, OF COURSE, THE THEORY OF CHURCH EXTENSION AS BEING IDENTIFIED THEREWITH." !!!—*Note by Dr. Chalmers.*

made, is in these terms :—" I have no favourite theory to support. and have engaged less than most others of my profession in the agitation of some of the questions which have lately been so keenly discussed, *not because I think these questions unimportant, or because I regard them with indifference*, but because not being able altogether to agree with those whose general views I am disposed to prefer, *I have been unwilling to come into public collision with such as have a most laudable object in view*, while at the same time, they may have adopted opinions different from mine in regard to the best method of attaining that object."

We leave it to our readers to judge how far Dr. Chalmers has fairly given the " very substance" of this passage, and how far he is warranted to represent it, which he does, as a sneer at the parochial system, and consequently at the cause of Church Extension.

Dr. Chalmers then proceeds :—

" The differences with his brethren, of which he would not tell us, he goes to your board, and pours into the ear of the Government Commissioners — no bad intimation of the danger that the Church would incur, by a Moderator, who having no common understanding with his brethren at large, would pour his unknown and before uncommunicated things into the ears of the Government itself."

Now, as to this, what will be said when it is known that the differences of opinion between Dr. Lee and Dr. Chalmers regarding that very parochial system had recently before formed the subject of a special correspondence between them, and that Dr. Lee refrained from publishing his sentiments, on the *express representation of Dr. Chalmers*, that the *collision* between them would be injurious to the interests of the Church? *We* shall simply say that this statement of Dr. Chalmers's is only in accordance with the rest of his pamphlet, and our readers will now be satisfied, that any thing *more* condemnatory could scarcely be said.

Finally, on the subject of this evidence, we subjoin the following statement by one of our number, who has seen the evidence. Mr. Bell, in his " Observations," published along with this " Statement," thus speaks,—" I say, since I am thus driven to it, that it is altogether untrue to say that Dr. Lee's evidence tells one thing, and that the manifesto of the Resolutionists tells another and an opposite thing. That it is untrue to say that the Church is misinformed, and misinformed in a way that is directly fitted to mislead them. And that it is utterly untrue to say that the evidence of Dr. Lee is a hostile evidence to the cause of Church Extension My readers are not to understand that I am telling them what Dr. Lee really said; and they are not to suppose I mean to convey the insinuation that he expressed his concurrence in *all* Dr. Chalmers' views

nor his plans. BUT I REPEAT, UNDER THE FULL KNOWLEDGE THAT A FEW WEEKS WILL DISCOVER THE EXACT TRUTH, THAT THE STATEMENTS OF DR. CHALMERS AS TO THE OPINION OF DR. LEE ON THIS MATTER ARE WHOLLY AND ABSOLUTELY CONTRARY TO THE FACT."

On the subject of Dr. Lee's evidence before the Select Committee of the House of Commons, we shall not enter at much length, though a short explanation may be offered.

The main objection brought forward to it by Dr. Chalmers, is, that it is *defective* in not containing a regular exposition of the whole theory of Endowments, Seat-rents, &c. and a vigorous pleading of the cause of the ministers of Edinburgh. Dr. Chalmers seems to forget that a party called to give evidence is a *witness*, and not a "*champion*" and an "*advocate*," and the consideration that he is so, might of itself afford a sufficient answer to his remarks on this head, independent of the peculiar circumstances in which Dr. Lee was examined, and of which Dr. Chalmers is now perfectly aware.

He had gone to London in the hope of recovering the long detained Records of the Church of Scotland, and on the forenoon of the 13th of June, when he had been only a few hours in town, he had ascertained that the books had been destroyed in the fire which consumed the Houses of Parliament. For sixteen years he had been using his utmost efforts to procure the restitution of these important volumes, and had repeatedly taken journeys to London at considerable expense, and great personal inconvenience, to effect this purpose; and it may well be believed, that his mortification on receiving the intelligence of their loss, must have been extreme. Just after he received it, he went to the Committee-Room in the hope of meeting a friend, when being perceived, Sir George Clerk, after a short conversation in the Committee, came up to him and asked him to give evidence on two points which the Committee wished to have on their minutes. Dr. Lee expressed an unwillingness to be examined without being previously apprised of the subjects; but on being assured that they were only plain matters of fact, he consented to state what he knew.

Unexpectedly he was pressed with questions on various other matters, to which he gave brief answers, anticipating that if any thing were imperfectly stated, it might be afterwards supplied. He did not consider the questions as having any particular reference to the schemes for the extension of the Church, and he had never heard that any discussion of this had occurred in the Committee; but his purpose evidently was to confine himself to matters of statistical inquiry; and though the questions were very numerous, he has never said more than that he could not at the moment

profess to give complete answers to every question. He felt a desire to explain one important matter at greater length, and on this he furnished himself with ample materials before the expiration of the week; but just at the time when he expected to have the opportunity of producing these facts, the Committee resolved to take no more evidence.

In these circumstances, we venture to think that there is not the slightest ground for the inferences based on the alleged deficiences of the evidence, and as to the subject of the annuity itself, he has shown sufficient zeal in the maintenance of the rights of the Clergy of Edinburgh.

As to that part of his evidence touching the University, Dr. Chalmers evidently feels very sore at the idea of any statement which would seem to create an impression that his class is decreasing in numbers, and this has no doubt given additional edge to his otherwise sharp enough suspiciousness, and he accordingly assumes that Dr. Lee introduced the information gratuitously, and with the malicious purpose of injuring him and the chance of an endowment.

Dr. Lee, in the Presbytery of Edinburgh, fully explained how the evidence, as printed, gave any colour to the notion of his having voluntarily introduced the information as to the decrease in the numbers of the Divinity class. He stated that several quesions were put regarding the emoluments of the chair. It was asked, what the amount of these were, and his answer was to this effect. It depends on the numbers who attend. Ten years ago the average was said to be about 250; but suppose the number to be 200, the amount will be L.420, as two guineas are paid by every student. Sir James Graham, who was examining him, then handed him a printed paper, bearing, that the amount of fees was now about L.250, on which Dr. Lee observed, that his calculation was only conjectural, proceeding on the idea, that the numbers were greater than it seemed they were. They seemed to have decreased more than he had supposed, but he knew *that the number of students of divinity had decreased of late.* After this followed the questions as to the decrease being general. Dr. Lee farther stated in his observations in the Presbytery, that the intermediate questions must have been struck out, retaining only the last observation, which was left as connecting and giving rise to the questions that followed.*

This explanation Dr. Chalmers states in a note, that he considered satisfactory at the time, but he now remarks, that he had received information that questions can never be withdrawn, without the corresponding answers being withdrawn likewise; and he infers,

* He might have added that he had no opportunity of revising his evidence.

that Dr. Lee's memory has failed him. On the other hand, in addition to Dr. Lee's averment upon the subject, we have seen the statement on this point of more than one member of the House of Commons, confirmatory of such withdrawals taking place, and in particular of one individual of most extensive experience in the practice of committees, and a member of the committee in question, who says, that "Dr. Chalmers is quite mistaken in supposing that no such practice as that of striking out questions without striking out all the answers which flow from them, occurs in parliamentary practice;" and adds, "it is quite a baseless ground to build a criminatory charge upon."

In regard to the evidence, so far as supposed to bear on the question of endowing the Divinity chairs, Dr. Lee certainly was not aware that any such matter was under consideration of the committee, and the questions put to him were in no way calculated to lead him to imagine they had reference to that subject. The answers evidently appear intended to remove an impression on the mind of the questioner, that attendance on the Divinity professor of *Edinburgh* was indispensable in a course of theological study. Dr. Chalmers however remarks—"It is thus he can contemplate, without one expression of regret, the extinction of the theological chair in Edinburgh." Now, so far from contemplating the extinction of this chair, Dr. Lee's answers commence with this explicit statement: "There is *no danger* of the class being closed." And most assuredly, no one will readily believe, especially on such overstrained inference as is attempted by Dr. Chalmers, that Dr. Lee is indifferent to the maintenance and endowment of the divinity chairs, in direct opposition to his well known sentiments on that subject, which have been published to the world for more than twelve years.

The following passage from Dr. Lee's "Memorial for the Bible Societies in Scotland," printed in 1824, will shew that his "disaffection" to the endowment of Professorships of Divinity, is of exactly the same nature as we have already proved his "disaffection" to Church Extension to be. "When so much has been gained in Scotland by individuals, whose duty, if well performed, has been as well paid for, many have thought that the advantage might have been much better applied. If *the right had been given to the Universities of Scotland*, and if they had been prevented from forming a combination, the competition would have secured excellence and accuracy of workmanship, and the profits might have saved the walls of these venerable institutions from crumbling into ruin. The nation would universally acknowledge it to be reasonable, that the profits of printing the Scriptures should be dedicated *to the support of religion and learning*. THE PROFESSORSHIPS OF DIVI-

NITY, *in particular, are almost all miserably endowed;* and as fees are not paid by theological students, the emoluments of those who sustain the important and difficult office of training the candidates for the ministry of the word, are, in some instances, inferior to the stipends of the poorest of the country clergy. If, instead of supplying the deficiencies of their incomes by presenting them to parochial charges in which they have not leisure to labour so abundantly as others, and at the same time to do justice to their academical appointments, they were required to take an inspection of the accuracy of the editions of the Scriptures, not only in the spoken language of the country, but in the original tongues, the profits would be sufficient to compensate all the labour, though it were divided among the seventeen persons who are Principals, Professors of Divinity, Ecclesiastical History, and Hebrew, in the five Universities of Scotland. But though such a distribution had been made of the patent of King's printer, greatly as we would wish to see these learned bodies prosper, we are sure that it would have been no benefit, either to them or to the nation, to have shut out from Scotland all the Bibles printed in England."

We have now gone over the charges brought against Dr. Lee; and we put it with the utmost confidence to every candid and impartial man to say, whether, defective even as our explanations on some points necessarily are, from the want of the evidence before the Royal Commission, he does not in his conscience believe that the accusations of Dr. Chalmers are unfounded and unjust?

Then if this *insuperable* barrier of supposed hostility to the cause of church extension be removed, can any man hesitate for one moment in his choice between the two candidates! As to Dr. Gardiner, it is only wonderful that any combination of events could have rendered it possible that he should ever have been *once thought of* for the Moderator's chair by persons having a regard for the credit of the Church; and still more marvellous that he should be proposed to be elevated over the heads of *so many—so very many* individuals beyond all question far superior to him in every claim to the honour, as in every qualification for the duty of the chair. On the other hand, Dr. Lee's merits, acquirements, and services are too well known to require recital. Dr. Chalmers, no doubt, makes light of his "learning"—rather too light of it considering his excessive admiration of the encouragements to learning in the Church of England;—but as *we* have no encouragements except that of the honourable distinction of the Moderatorship, we should only be the more ready to employ that in paying the tribute due to a qualification so comparatively and necessarily rare among us. But what could be said, if we were so to confirm the imputation of disregard to the value of learning which has been

cast upon our church, as to reject the most eminent man of learning within her pale, one of the few of our number whose name is known in other lands, and confer the highest distinction we have to bestow *in preference* upon an individual utterly unknown even in his own church, on what is substantially the ground of his being a staunch political partizan?

We have seen how little sympathy Dr. Chalmers' present colleagues of the Old Moderators have with him in his grounds for excluding Dr. Lee; and without intending any disparagement of them, we venture to think that even if we *were* assuming a right to nominate the Moderator, we might perhaps make as judicious a choice, in the opinion of the old Moderators themselves, as they have sanctioned, by their adoption of Dr. Gardiner in the present instance. But we make no such pretension. Dr. Lee has for some time been pointed out by the general opinion of the Church, as the individual best entitled to the chair, among those who have not yet passed it. Dr. Chalmers himself confirmed that opinion before he took up his present groundless suspicions, by himself proposing him. Dr. Gordon has declined to be put in nomination till the honour shall have been conferred on Dr. Lee. Dr. Dickson refused partly on the same ground to be put in competition with him. Dr. Chalmers' colleagues, Drs. M'Gill and Thomson, two out of the four who by the ex-Moderators' own arrangement were this year entitled to the choice, proposed him to the body:—no objection was stated to him:—he was publicly announced as the candidate in the General Assembly, and not a whisper was raised against him, within or without the walls either of the Assembly or the old Moderators' conclave, till Drs. Chalmers and Macfarlan commenced their opposition, which is still being prosecuted with such blind and relentless virulence. In these circumstances, we are merely carrying forward what certainly *was* the almost unanimous wish of the Church, and would have continued so, but for the resistance and accusations of Dr. Chalmers.

The representing therefore of us, or rather of the laymen of our number, as endeavouring to usurp the privilege of nominating the moderator, is nothing else than an unworthy attempt to excite into action a natural feeling on the part of ministers, in aid of the opposition set up by Drs. Chalmers and Macfarlan. We have no ambition for such a privilege; and much as we would have condemned the slighting of Dr. Lee, though unaccompanied by any reflections on his character, we probably might not, in the present state of the church, have involved it in any contest or controversy on the subject, had it not been that, from the grounds on which his intended exclusion was rested, his character and his fidelity to the church were arraigned, and the Church herself attempted

to be placed in a position injurious to her interests, and in particular to the cause of her extension.

In regard to the merits of the system it is not surprising that Dr. Chalmers should defend it. It is true that in 1821, when Dr. Cook was set up against the old Moderators' nominee, he reprobated and resisted it, as a "mode of management which had been felt to be *illegitimate*, and *ought no longer to exist*,"—recommending instead, "that all the Members of Assembly should meet some days previous to the regular meetings of Assembly, and that being open to every individual member, they should, by a majority of voices, collect the general opinion, as to who should be elected to that chair. By thus doing," he remarked, "in an open arena what was now concocted in a secret conclave, of the mysteries of which he could not speak, as he had never been admitted to them, they would be enabled to meet in peace and charity, and good understanding, in friendship and brotherly love." But it is only the usual result, that he should assume a very different tone when himself admitted into the "mysteries" of the "secret conclave;" and he must already have experienced the great practical convenience of being able to shroud the figures of himself and Dr. Macfarlan under the cloak of the 'Old Moderators,' which though sorely tattered and thread bare, still serves in some measure to clothe his proceedings with the character of "prescriptive and possessory right," "the use and wont" of a "long established initiative."

With reference to its own merits, we do not need to say any thing of the system as it subsisted until recently. A self-nominated junta is certainly not the best depository of power; but formerly there was at least some respectability in a body who had themselves passed the chair of competition, uniting in a common choice, and, so far as appeared, on common grounds, without the necessity of attributing it to the mere spirit of party. But now this appearance has been abandoned, under the arrangement recently adopted among the old Moderators themselves. The selection has been avowedly made a matter of *party*, and not merely of party in the *Church*, but of party in the *body of old Moderators*. The whole body do not even unite to sit in judgment on the merits of the individual proposed, while alternating their choice in alternate years from the different sides of the Church; but they leave exclusively to those of their number who chuse to class themselves with the side from which the election is to be made, the choice of the individual to be nominated, the others *as a matter of course* adopting the person proposed by them. The Moderator thus chosen, is avowedly brought in as the representative of a party, and not merely of a party in the Church, but he is degraded

into the position of the representative of a party in the body of old Moderators. It is clear that under such a system no one will, in general, be proposed, however eminent, who cannot be ranked as a partizan, and probably a keen one, although no requisite for the chair can be more important than unbiassed impartiality. It is equally clear, that the party sections in the body will not readily admit any who will not concur in keeping up this internal arrangement, so that the choice of the Moderator may be made subservient to the paltry intrigues of the sections into which the body itself is divided. Such a system is degrading to the Church, and it cannot but be injurious; for many a high-minded man, who would with grateful satisfaction accept, and infinitely value this high office, if conferred by the general voice of the Church, as a mark of approbation to him whom she delighted to honour, would reject and utterly disdain it when proffered to him as the *party* nominee of a *party* section of the ex-Moderators.

The present case shews the miserable working of the system. Of the four, to whom, by the arrangement, the choice was left, two propose one individual, the other section of course acquiescing, in accordance with the agreement. The remaining two of the four disapprove of this, and either by superior tactics or superior energy, manage to be the sole representatives of their section at the next meeting, when, having failed in their efforts to obtain a man of more note to be their nominee, they propose Dr. Gardiner, who, however respectable he may be in his own parish and presbytery, is utterly unknown to the Church at large; and he accordingly, the choice in reality of only two out of the whole body—(the other half of their section having previously selected, and proposed another)—is adopted by the other section, and so comes forth, in point of form, the nominee of the whole body, though chosen only by a segment of one of the sections of which it is composed. No wonder that other grounds of support were resorted to for him than such a nomination as this!

These grounds, however, have hitherto consisted mainly of the alleged disqualifications of Dr. Lee, to which we have already sufficiently adverted. Excepting the general assertion of Drs. Chalmers and Macfarlan that Dr. Gardiner is a man "thoroughly to be trusted," no information is given to enable the Church to judge of his eminence and his peculiar claims *in preference to many others besides Dr. Lee, to whom the eyes of the Church have been turned as proper candidates for this honour.* Reasons connected with particular localities may no doubt occasionally give rise to a preference, which personal considerations alone might not warrant. Such, however, can have no place here; for important as the

Synod of Glasgow and Ayr is, it certainly cannot be viewed as so highly exalted over all the Synods of the Church, as to entitle it to have the Moderator chosen from its bounds *four* times in *five* successive years.* Indeed, the grounds of choice are avowed to be purely personal; and a full statement of these was peculiarly necessary, in regard to an individual set up over the heads of an array of far superior men, against a person of so wide-spread a reputation as Dr. Lee, and himself so little known, that if such a thing could have been that he were proposed in the Assembly, without the inquiry occasioned by a previous announcement, at least four-fifths of the members, on hearing his name, would exclaim, "Who is Dr. Gardiner?" It would therefore have been very desirable to have known the grounds on which he is so thoroughly to be trusted, and on which his preference to so many others, whose attachment to the Church cannot be called in question, is rested,—the proofs of his zeal for Church Extension, and in particular, *when* it began to shew itself. He has certainly had an ample field for its display. For more than thirty years he has been minister of a parish now containing 5,500 souls, with the church at one extremity of it; and it would be satisfactory to know what a model of the Church Extension and parochial principles he has made it during so long an incumbency, without the necessity of any *external pressure* which *less zealous* friends to the cause might have required.†

This and similar information being at present withheld, the Church can only look to the recommendation of Dr. Chalmers, that he is "thoroughly to be trusted in those great public questions which are now pending between the Church and the Government," and judge of that recommendation by the conduct in the Moderator's chair of the individual to whom it was previously applied. Taking this rule, we must assume that he is a keen political partizan in opposition to the present Government,—a man who, appointed to

* In 1833, the Moderator was Dr. Stirling of Craigie, in the Synod of Glasgow and Ayr. In 1834, Dr. P. Macfarlan of Greenock in the same Synod. In 1835, Dr. Thomson of Perth, in the Synod of Perth and Stirling. In 1836, Dr. M'Leod of Glasgow, in the Synod of Glasgow and Ayr; and Dr. Gardiner, in 1837, would make *four* Moderators from that Synod in *five* successive years.

† Dr. Macfarlan rests his concurrence in bringing forward Dr. Gardiner, in a great measure on that individual's being a proper representative of the party to which Dr. Macfarlan considers himself to belong. We are far from thinking it a proper reason for the appointment of a Moderator, that he is a party man; but to those who think it so, and when it is given, it surely would be right to make the Church aware of the candidate's title to be considered a proper representative of that party—to point out the subjects on which he differs from the followers of Dr. Cook, and his opinions on the more interesting questions at present pending, as the reform of the eldership, revival of presbyterial visitations, and the like. We hope if this ground of supporting him is to be maintained, that the want of information on those points will be supplied.

the office of Moderator during the dependence of a negociation for an endowment from the Government to the Church, instead of assuming a position of dignified independence, shall range himself in the ranks of most determined hostility—who shall not only do this in his character of an individual, but as Moderator of the Church of Scotland shall, after presiding at a meeting of her highest court, which condemned the practice of clergymen attending political meetings at all, sign a requisition for a public dinner to the leader of the party opposed to the Government, thus implicating the Church in his own particular political sentiments—shall attend at that dinner, and accepting the precedence over senior ministers present, which he could only possess as Moderator, speak necessarily as such, and avow the most determined hostility to that very Government, between which and the Church the negociation for endowments depends. Such is a Moderator "thoroughly to be trusted" for conducting and successfully carrying through with the Government the important questions now in issue between them.

The Church may well pause before she makes a similar choice. We assuredly should never wish to see subserviency to the Government of the day evinced by the Church of Scotland. But there is a position distinct alike from subserviency and from party hostility—shewing a due respect to the rulers of the land, and yet maintaining unimpaired her full and free independence. At the present moment, were she to assume this, her only true position, she might be confident of gaining her object, *whichever* political party were in power. From that position the efforts of Dr. Chalmers are calculated to remove her. With strange infatuation he labours to make this contest a political struggle, and to identify on the one hand, hostility to the Government with the support of Dr. Gardiner and attachment to the Church Extension scheme, and on the other, adherence to the Government with support of Dr. Lee and hostility to Church Extension; and to a certain extent he will undoubtedly fix that character upon it.

To the Church Extension scheme such an identification is ruinous. It has been the aim of the enemies of the church all along to attach that character to it; but by the exertions of many of the members of the Committee, the imputation has been successfully repelled. When however fixed upon it by the Convener of the Committee itself, it will be hopeless to get rid of it; and nothing, certainly not the most hostile Moderator, could be more fatal to its cause.

To the Church at large, also, his efforts, if successful, would be most injurious. They would force her into a state of political partizanship. If the clergy adopt the course he recommends, they place their hopes of an endowment on the hazard of a die—on the

doubtful chances of the struggle for power between two political parties. If that to which he would wish them to attach themselves prove victorious, they will share the triumph, though not without having linked themselves by chains to the chariot wheels of the conquerors. If it be defeated, their hopes are gone for ever.

It were wise that the Church considered well whether she will stake all on such a chance, or whether she will not act in accordance alike with her duty as a Church of Christ, her own dignity, and her true interest, and take that position which is alone consistent with her character, and would ensure success to her present claims, whatever party may wield the reins of power.

We would have wished, before concluding, to have adverted to the marked and special attack on one of our number, the Rev. Dr. Welsh;* and if we were to enter upon it, we feel that there would be some risk, so strongly do we reprobate the attack, of our being led to use expressions too much akin to those with which we have ourselves been assailed. Dr. Welsh will not, however, consent to its being made the subject of public discussion, being willing rather to leave his character unvindicated, than to obtrude upon the public particulars which could not be alluded to without a violation of the sanctities of friendship and the confidence of private intercourse.

Dr. Chalmers deems his cause "worthy of martyrdom." Surely, then, his weapons should have been worthy of his cause. But will not the cruellest martyrdom he will have to suffer be that of his own remembrances? We shall suppose that a few short months are past, and that he has succeeded in the present contest even to a wish—that he has placed Dr. Gardiner in the Moderator's chair, and induced an overwhelming majority of the Assembly to concur with him in branding Dr. Lee as a traitor to the Church, prepared to sell her for a hireling's reward, and us as conspirators with a hostile Government for her destruction, "having no other object than at the expense of her dearest interests to achieve for ourselves a party and political triumph;" and that after the first intoxication of victory, he pauses and calmly looks around him, and thinks of the faithful band of ardent, devoted, long-tried friends and fellow-labourers, whom he has driven with abusive violence from his side,—the characters of worth whom he has aspersed,—the flames his accusing circular have lighted in the church,—and the fatal, irretrievable injury which shall have been inflicted by him on the very cause for the success of which his heart so in-

* We do not refer to the observations on Lord Moncreiff, because it is more consistent with the dignity of his station to leave unnoticed insinuations obviously arising from a blind and presumptuous misconception of the accuser's own position and character.

tensely burns ;—when he thinks of all this, he will at last, but too late, acknowledge that he has dearly, far too dearly, bought the free indulgence of an unthwarted will.

And must this then be so? It is true that Dr. Chalmers's enthusiastic zeal, and his impetuous ardour in the prosecution of what he feels to be a great and noble cause, makes him fix his eye so exclusively and keenly on that single object, as to overlook every thing else around, and that the freedom from any opposition on the part of his friends, to which he has been accustomed, renders him still more impatient of all things that even seem to run counter to the vehemence of his desires, and impels him to thrust them utterly aside with rash and hasty jealousy, without taking time to consider or understand them :—but will he *altogether* abandon the reins of judgment? After fixing his gaze on the object he is striving to attain, he has shut his eyes, and rushed on in its direction, reckless of every thing that bars his way :—but will he not pause *one moment* in his impetuous career? Let him consider for an instant. Let him bethink himself. Let him think what *it really is* that he is doing, and see that these are envenomed darts he is so fiercely scattering abroad. Can he seriously believe, if he reflects for a moment, that these men, his brethren, whose judgment he has hitherto been wont to trust, are truly the senseless dupes he would persuade himself to fancy them? Can he possibly believe that those others, the very men who for more than two years have been co-operating with him with hearty zeal in forwarding his great cause, have suddenly leagued themselves in a conspiracy to destroy it? Can he believe that those who have freely spent their labour, their time, and their substance, in promoting the extension of the Church, should on an instant become ready recklessly to sacrifice it to please a Government to whom they have no tie, and from motives of partizanship of which they never evinced a spark before? It *cannot be* that he believes this. He CANNOT believe it. Then if he finds that his excited feelings have led him so utterly to misjudge *them*, may he not *suspect* it to be *possible* that they have also led him to misunderstand others? He sees no difficulty in imagining, that these "accursed politics," as he justly terms them, have made *us* oppose what we most ardently cling to, and sacrifice at once "private friendship and public weal:" Can he not fancy it to be more likely that the same "accursed politics" may have produced on *him* the *much more natural result* of leading him to misconstrue the motives and the actions of those whom he deems his opponents? Let him awake from this vision-haunted dream of jealousy and suspicion. Let him drive away those murky clouds of prejudice which obscure his

judgment and poison his feelings, and the nobleness of his nature will then resume its sway, and prompt him to make some allowance for difference of temperament, or even for difference of opinion, to retract the unfounded charges he has uttered, to do justice to those he has so causelessly maligned, and to bring himself back to that state when he was willing to unite in the tribute to Dr. Lee, which he acknowledged to be his due, before that event which gave rise to the first step in his race of suspicion, and which he is already conscious afforded for it no warrant. Let him do this, and all will yet be well. These sad breaches will be healed. The streams of affection and good-will which have been violently forced from their beds, will again gladden their ancient courses. Harmony and joy will come again, and united once more, we shall together labour with heart and hand for the advancement of our common cause, and only the more cordially that it has suffered from our unhappy division. It rests with *him* to accomplish this. Lesser men could not do it. He can. The greatness of his return will more than atone for the greatness of his error. The violent scene we have witnessed will be forgotten as a dream of the night, and instead of being like the winter's lightening, with its unnatural and lurid gleam, the dire forerunner of coming tempests, the fearful sign of future woe, it will seem to have been but as the passing thunder storm of summer, which, though it may startle and alarm, leaves, when it is gone, a brighter and more peaceful gladness on the face of the green and smiling earth.

APPENDIX.

In an Appendix Dr. Chalmers has represented that he employed a gentleman to make a survey of the Old Church Parish, and that he had completed the same, with the exception of a few families, partly in Hunter Square, and partly in the Old Fishmarket Close, and the following is the result:—

Families visited 286; of these 25 had resided less than 6 months in the parish; 58 from 6 months to a year; 100 from 1 to 5 years; 46 from 5 to 10 years; 30 from 10 to 20 years; 62 from 20 to 30 years, and 6 upwards of 30 years. (If he had been very studious of accuracy he might have added 9 unaccounted for.)

On this subject we have applied to Mr. Paterson, Surveyor for the Improvements, whose testimony is not likely to be biassed. He states that he has recently gone over the survey books of the Old Church Parish, and he finds the total number of houses actually inhabited in that parish, (and a small division of the Cowgate, of which the survey-books do not distinctly point out the parochial boundaries,) to be, at an average of the years 1834–5, and 1835–6 . . . 556

Of these charged at and under L.3 yearly rent . . 41

Removals in 1834–5, not including 50 weekly and monthly tenants mentioned below, ... 245

Removals, with the same exception, in 1835–6 . . 228

To these removals may be added the greater part, or nearly the whole, of not fewer than fifty houses in Stevenlaw's Close, Old Assembly Close, &c. the proprietors of which compound for the Improvement tax, as the houses are let by the week or month, and the names of tenants are not altered from year to year, however frequent their removals.

In the above enumeration no shops are included, nor houses which were empty during these years,—nor families residing in public offices or places of business. If these were included, a large number might be added to the 270 families unaccounted for in the census got up for Dr. Chalmers, by whose account the population of the Old Church parish must fall greatly short of the enumeration of the Voluntaries.

Dr. Chalmers, in his Appendix, inserts what he calls "the following very satisfactory communication which he received the other day from one of the most eminent of his statists and philanthropists—'I surveyed a plebeian district (Carnegie Street and adjacent places) some months ago, for the express purpose of ascertaining to what extent its population fluctuated. The result of my investigations was as follows:—Out of 355 families whom I visited, I found only 4 who had been less than one year, and only 25 who had been a single year resident in the district. But I found that 257 families had been five years or upwards; and 155 had been 10 years or upwards—and 60 had been 20 years or upwards, residing in the same house, or the same stair, or the same street, or some street in the immediate neighbourhood.'"

Mr. Paterson, the surveyor, remarks on this statement, that as the number of families said to have been visited is 355, the statist has accounted for them in a way which he thinks very singular,—thus,

Families in occupation of their present houses for less than 1 year		4
Do.	a single year	25
Do.	5 years and upwards	257
Do.	10 years and upwards	155
Do.	20 years and upwards	60
	In all	501

How is it that the amount is overstated in the detail by 146?

Now, mark the plain result of the official survey for three years.

The gross number of inhabited houses in Carnegie Street and Dalrymple Place for the current year, is		324
The number of removals in 1834–5 was		140
Do.	in 1835–6	95
Do.	in 1836–7	125

The average of removals for the last three years is therefore 120 annually, out of 324, in one of the best plebeian districts in Edinburgh. The surveyor cannot pretend to reconcile these facts with the statement contained in Dr. Chalmers's Appendix.

Dr. Chalmers has thought fit to institute also a survey of part of Lady Yester's parish, of which Dr. Lee did not say a single word. He says that the part to which he refers may be fairly called the St. Giles's of Edinburgh, including Hastie's Close, the east side of College Wynd, &c. He adds, on the authority of his Surveyor, that of 204 families, only 52 have been less than one year,—this is a proportion of changes much greater than could have been inferred from his previous statements. But it may be worth while to notice what the Surveyor says on this portion of the survey.

13 are said to have been 20 years in the parish.	
26 from 10 to 20 years.	
49 from 4 to 10 years.	
52 less than one year.—Amount	140
Not accounted for	64

Now, Dr. Chalmers may know how to account for these 64; but if he does not, it is conceivable that many of them, if not all, may be included in the number of families whose occupancy was of very brief duration, and in this case 116 out of 204 might have removed in a year, for any thing which Dr. Chalmers has shewn to the contrary. We do not understand the changes to have been so numerous as this,—but we do understand that the whole families in that parish are above 600, instead of 478, as stated by Dr. Chalmers. And the Surveyor has reported with regard to Hastie's Close as follows:—

The number of tenants at the commencement of 1834–5 was 27. In that year there were 22 removals, and 2 additional tenants not previously accommodated there. Of the tenants in Hastie's Close 6 are marked in the Surveyors books as *weekly*, some at 6d. and some at 1s. per week. At the commencement of 1835–6 there were 29 tenants in that Close, 16 are marked as having removed in the year, and 8 new tenants are entered as having come into the possession of houses not occupied the preceding year.

These facts shew that Lady Yester's, though less variable than some other parishes, is not a specimen of a stationary population.